

Long Range Transportation Plan Task Force
July 18, 2011 Meeting Recap

Welcome & Introductions

PC – Richard Martin
TAC - Jane Fleig, Adrian Reid, Kurt Babcock
CAC - Ted Miller, Jack Baker, Sarah Ryterband
Staff - Josh Desmond, Raymond Hess

Peer Community Research – Tippecanoe Area Plan Commission (Lafayette, IN)

Raymond Hess shared his findings of the Tippecanoe Area Plan Commission serving Lafayette, IN. He spoke with Doug Poad:

Travel Demand Model (TDM)

- 4 step (Trip generation, distribution, assignment, and mode choice model) – They have mode choice but number of trips for transit is relatively small. Most ridership is on campus. The Area Plan Commission (APC or MPO) calculates transit trips on campus as well as ridership through or to campus. The result is a good estimate for number of trips for transit. This number is pulled off the top of special generators. Other areas don't warrant analysis
- Pedestrian trips? No, because the number of trips is so small. It would also be difficult to identify generators and attractions.
- Bicycle trips? No
- Freight and Intermodal. No. Heavy trucks are concentrated on interstate and state roads. Numbers on local roads are small especially at peak. Trucking companies are invited to participate in the LRTP process but no input/response is ever received. There is increasing focus on maintaining existing infrastructure – when were arterials repaved/reconstructed – a factor which freight has notable impact
- How is land use factored into the model?
 - How many land use categories did you use for your model? 3 - Residential, retail, non-retail. Campus is a special generator (combined with parking study – good to identify park and ride which don't identify trip destinations). The APC is also a land use agency. A land use model was developed in the 1970s. The County was divided into grids and each grid was graded based on 7 different criteria (soil, proximity to utilities, roads, etc.). The result is that each area was assigned ideal land use categories like agriculture, residential, commercial, etc. This led to good compact development. Most development is in the City limits and it is known where development will happen in the future. The APC maintains a subdivision database as to what will develop in the next 10 years based on the number of lots of a development. School locations, utility expansion also drives development.
- Please list the sources of data used in the creation of your model?
 - Census, some ACS to help validate only, don't use NHTS, used last CTTTP data (vehicles per household and trip distribution). Transit information. Building and demo data updated every month. Aerials flown during census.
- Did you conduct supplemental surveys (add-ons)? No. Looked at doing it but was cost prohibitive (>\$100k). Did an occupancy survey on bridges (typically work

related trips – mostly single occupancy vehicle). Travel surveys were done in the 70's through the newspaper. Could hit key groups. Looking at doing a new plan without updating the model since all other factors have remain unchanged – will focus more on maintenance.

- When was your model developed (date)? 2006 (base year 2003/04)
- How much did it cost to develop your model? In-house
- What software program was used to develop your model? TransCAD. Also use (dating back to 90s) add-ons for travel modeling. “INtrips” to identify destinations/origins based on IN data. Found very useful. Use a program to determine external-to-external and external-to-internal trips.
- Are you able to regularly maintain/use your model in-house? Yes

Plan Development

- How long did it take to develop and adopt your plan? Started Sept. 2004 for external to internal trips. Complete in April 2006.
- What role did the old plan or other plans (comp plans, transit plans, corridor plans) play in the development of your new plan? Land use was biggest influence. Thoroughfare plan, Bike Ped Plan, Airport Plan and TDP are all standalone plans but get mention as standalone document. Purdue's transportation Plan was adopted into LRTP (but changed certain aspects of plan which has created difficulties).

Project Selection

- How did you deal with project identification and selection:
 - Most projects have been in the Plan for years. The APC identifies areas with problematic levels of service. They also get project ideas from different committees and citizens. They run them through the model to see how they improve the Level of Service (LOS). The preferred alternative is a combination of projects that improves the LOS the most. In the future, the APC might look at using more generic definitions of “over-capacity” and “under-capacity” as opposed to LOS A-F.
 - Who proposed projects for consideration in the plan (MPO staff, Committees, LPAs, citizens)? Committees and LPAs.
 - How do projects move from the Long Range Plan to the TIP (MPO driven vs. LPA driven)? Test fiscal constraint and leave LPAs to self-select projects for elimination. 3 major LPAs propose projects and take turns at implementing projects. There has not yet been a need for more rigorous testing. Projects are phased to ensure they advance.

Public Participation

- What methods were used to engage the public, at what point in the process, and frequency?
 - Online: all information is on the web
 - In-person: citizen group.
 - Other: the press, contact letters to get minority groups involved, don't go out in person.

- Did you have a steering committee or task force? No – staff made recommendations to the committees.

Other Thoughts

- Did your Plan have any progressive measures? There is an increased focus on maintenance and livability (sidewalks, trails, connections to transit). Due to the uncertainty of funding, the APC avoids identifying high cost projects (BRT, light rail) which might not get funded.
- What would you do differently? There are more projects in the Plan than there is funding for implementation. Consequently many projects can't advance to the TIP. Needs should be separated from wants. A local option tax might help address some funding shortfalls.

In response to the presentation, Mr. Miller suggested the LRTP Task Force review the Purdue Travel Plan. Mr. Reid suggested the Lafayette Crash Report be reviewed. Ms. Ryterband was surprised their TDM didn't address bike/ped since it is a large campus setting. Mr. Baker suggested looking more closely at how Lafayette addresses transit in their TDM and LRTP.

Visioning Process

Mr. Desmond reviewed a visioning process proposal developed by staff (included in the meeting packet). Public meetings will be held early in the process in Bloomington and Ellettsville to determine the overall vision for the MPO transportation system. There will also be interviews with several key stakeholder groups to get their perspective on the transportation network. The stakeholder groups identified are: Local Business/Employers; Freight users; Accessibility concerns; Bicycle/Pedestrian groups; Emergency Responders; Transit interests; Environmental Justice groups; and Schools. Staff also proposes presentations to local legislative bodies such as Bloomington Common Council, Monroe County Commissioners, and Ellettsville Town Council. There will also be a survey used to gauge public views on transportation issues. The Task Force has supported a survey which is "statistically valid" which would likely have to be undertaken by a consultant. The last proposed component of the visioning process is a second round of public workshops to be held in Bloomington and Ellettsville.

Mr. Martin asked how the MPO can engage people who come into and go out of Monroe County since they are heavy transportation network users. It was suggested the MPO try to engage carpool groups like Central Indiana Commuter Services, Zimride (IU), or groups at Crane. The Task Force also made recommendations on additional stakeholders to engage: Environmental Justice – Martha's House, Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, and Community Kitchen; Businesses – Convention and Visitors Bureau, delivery services (e.g. beer, Sysco, Coke, Pepsi), small employers, Bloomington Economic Development Council, Local First; Freight – Young Trucking, UPS, FedEx, railroad operators, and commercial garbage haulers.

TAZ/TAD Delineation

Mr. Hess explained the Census Bureau contacted all MPOs so that they may update their Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) and create new Transportation Analysis Districts (TADs) for Census purposes. TAZs should have a population no less than 600 people. TADs are an aggregation of TAZs and should have a population of no less than 20,000. Mr. Hess explained

MPO staff, with the help of GIS staff, established Census TAZs by combining TAZs from the Travel Demand Model to meet the minimum population threshold. Based on direction received from other modelers across the state, staff was careful not to split a Travel Demand Model TAZ between two different Census TAZs.

TADs are new to the Census and have been developed to help identify regions of common transportation characteristics which may cross political boundary lines. Staff started by creating a TAD around campus since it has a travel pattern which may differ from other parts of the County. The urban area around campus was split into two different TADs. Finally, staff created one donut TAD for the remaining portions of the County. Mr. Martin took exception to this methodology and suggested that it reflects a bias towards Bloomington. Mr. Hess explained the TADs were created this way to reflect different travel patterns – rural areas of the County probably have different travel behaviors than urban areas and that all areas of the County are still incorporated into both a specified TAZ and TAD. Mr. Martin wanted to know the effect of these determinations. Mr. Hess stated that the MPO can create its own TAZs and TADs as part of its modeling process and that the Census TAZs and TADs are independent. Staff tried to create some consistency between the two. Mr. Martin wanted to know if these Census TAZ and TAD determinations will have bearing on funding or if they can be changed.